



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/828,351	04/06/2001	Niakam Kazemi	363	1712

7590
CIENA Corporation
Legal Department
1201 Winterson Road
Linthicum, MD 21090

05/07/2003

EXAMINER

TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/828,351

Applicant(s)

KAZEMI, NIAKAM

Examiner

Cam-Y T Truong

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-26 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kazemi et al (USP 6381556).

As to claims 1 and 14, Kazemi teaches the claimed limitations:

“a symptom data entity storing symptoms of manufacturing process defects” as a defect description entity stores description of defect such as defective unit and other optical assembly error. The defect description is represented as a symptom data entity (fig. 47A);

“a defect data entity , storing defects of the manufacturing process” as the defect entity stores a list of defects such as 556, 558 or 558 (fig. 47A);

“an action data entity storing repair actions for remedying related defects” as the action description entity stores repair actions for remedying related defects such as CA104 replaced optical, RA152 removed & replace or CA000 other (fig. 47A);

"said defect data entity being associated with said symptom data entity" as the defect 556 has defect description 0144 incorrect fiber Routing. Thus, the defect entity is associated with defect description entity (fig. 47A);

"said action data entity being associated with said defect data entity" as the defect entity 558 has the action description entity CA104 replaced optical. Thus, the defect entity is associated with the action description entity.

As to claims 2 and 15, Kazemi teaches the claimed limitation:

"wherein said manufacturing quality information database tracks a plurality of manufacturing processes" as (fig. 7, lines 35-55);

"the manufacturing quality information database further comprising: a process data entity storing identities of the manufacturing processes, said symptom data entity, said defect data entity, and said action data entity being associated with said process data entity" as (figs. 27-34).

As to claims 3 and 16, Kazemi teaches the claimed limitation:

"an item data entity storing identities of manufactured items" as the product ID entity stores a list of identities of products such as 1, 2, 4. For example, product ID 1 has product name multwave 1600 (fig. 27);

"said symptom data entity, said defect data entity, and said action data entity being associated with said item data entity" as (fig. 47A, col. 19, lines 65-67; col. 20, lines 1-40).

As to claims 4 and 17, Kazemi teaches the claimed limitations:

"a symptom category data entity for storing symptom categories of manufacturing defects" as (col. 20, lines 25-60);

"said symptom data entity being associated with said symptom category data entity" as (fig. 47).

As to claim 5, Kazemi teaches the claimed limitations:

"a process data entity storing identities of the manufacturing processes" as operation ID entity stores ID of the manufacturing processes (fig. 8, figs. 17-18);

"a process/symptom frequency data entity observing a relationship frequency between the symptom categories and the manufacturing process identities" as (fig. 38).

As to claims 6 and 19, Kazemi teaches the claimed limitations:

"a defect category data entity for storing defect categories of the manufacturing process" as (col. 20, lines 25-40);

"said defect data entity being associated with said defect category data entity" as (fig. 47).

As to claims 7 and 20, Kazemi teaches the claimed limitation "a symptom/defect frequency data entity observing a relationship frequency between the symptom categories and the defect categories" as (figs. 39-40, col. 22, lines 10-20).

As to claims 8 and 21, Kazemi teaches the claimed limitations:

“an action category data entity storing action categories” as the system displays 4 icons for selection, i.e., level 1 defects Main Categories such as Level-1 defect description, Level-2 defect description and Level-3 defect description. Each Level defect description is associated with each action description. Thus, the action description of the level-1 defect description can be called a first category and the action description of level-2 defect description can be called a second category. The action description of level-1 defect, which is represented as an action category data entity, has different kind of action description such as replaced optical and removed & replace (fig. 47A, 50; col. 25, lines 15-25);

“said action data entity being associated with said action category data entity” as action description entity stores different kind of action description such as replaced optical and removed & replace (fig. 47A);

As to claim 9, Kazemi teaches the claimed limitation “a defect/action frequency data entity observing a relationship frequency between the defect categories and the action categories” as (figs. 41-46).

As to claims 10 and 23, Kazemi teaches the claimed limitations:

“a process data entity storing identities of the manufacturing processes” as operation ID stores identities of the manufacturing processes (figs. 28-29);

"a symptom category data entity storing symptom categories of manufacturing defects" as defect description stores different kind of defect description such as incorrect fiber routing and other optic at assembly error (fig. 47A);

"a defect category data entity storing defect categories of the manufacturing process" as level-1 defect description stores different kind of defect description such as optical and electronic (fig. 50 A);

"a process/symptom/defect frequency data entity observing a relationship frequency between the manufacturing process identities, the symptom categories and the defect categories" as (figs. 50A-51).

As to claims 11 and 24, Kazemi teaches the claimed limitations:

"a process data entity storing identities of the manufacturing processes" as operation ID stores identities of the manufacturing processes (figs. 28-29);

"a symptom category data entity storing symptom categories of manufacturing defects" as defect description stores different kind of defect description such as incorrect fiber routing and other optic at assembly error (fig. 47A);

"a defect category data entity storing defect categories of the manufacturing process" as level-1 defect description stores different kind of defect description such as optical and electronic (fig. 50 A);

"an action category data entity storing action categories" as an action description stores different kind of action description such as CA000 other and CA104 Replaced Optical (fig. 47A);

"a process/symptom/defect/action frequency data entity observing a relationship frequency between the manufacturing process identities, the symptom categories, the defect categories, and the action categories" as (figs. 50A-51).

As to claims 12 and 25, Kazemi teaches the claimed limitations

"a symptom category data entity storing symptom categories of manufacturing defects" as operation ID stores identities of the manufacturing processes (figs. 28-29);

"a defect category data entity storing defect categories of the manufacturing process" as level-1 defect description stores different kind of defect description such as optical and electronic (fig. 50 A);

"said symptom data entity being associated with said symptom category data entities" as defect description stores different kind of defect description such as incorrect fiber routing and other optic at assembly error (fig. 47A);

"said defect data entity being associated with said defect category data entity" as the defect is associated with 0144 incorrect fiber routing of defect description (fig. 47A);

"said defect category entity being associated with said symptom category data entity" as defect 556 is associated with defect description 0144 incorrect fiber routing (fig. 47).

As to claims 13 and 26, Kazemi teaches the claimed limitations:

"a defect category data entity storing defect categories of the manufacturing

process" as level-1 defect description stores different kind of defect description such as optical and electronic (fig. 50 A);

"an action category data entity storing action categories" as action description stores different kind of action description such CA000 other and CA104 replaced optical (fig. 47A);

"said defect data entity being associated with said defect category data entity" as defect 556 is associated with 0144 incorrect fiber routing (fig. 47A);

"said action data entity being associated with said action category data entity" as action description is associated with CA000 other (fig. 47A);

"said action category data entity being associated with said defect category data entity" as leve-1 defect is associated with defect 556 (fig. 47A, col. 25, lines 15-30).

As to claim 18, Kazemi teaches the claimed limitations:

"tracking a plurality of manufacturing processes with the manufacturing quality information database" as (fig. 38);

"storing identities of the manufacturing processes in a process data entity" as storing operation lds in operation ID entity (fig. 28-29)

"observing a relationship frequency between the symptom categories and the manufacturing process" as (fig. 46);

"storing the relationship frequency in a process/symptom frequency data entity" as (fig. 46).

As to claim 22, Kazemi teaches the claimed limitations:

"observing a relationship frequency between the defect categories and the action categories" as (col. 23, lines 23-50);

"storing the relationship frequency in a defect/action frequency data entity" as (col. 23, lines 23-50).

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure

Guinta et al (USP 6161101).

Csipkes et al (USP 6167401).

Contact Information

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam-Y Truong whose telephone number is (703-605-1169). The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:00AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu, can be reached on (703-305-4393). The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)-746-7239 (formal communications intended for entry), or: (703)-746-7240 (informal communication labeled PROPOSED or DRAFT).

Art Unit: 2172

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703-305-3900).

Cam-Y Truong

4/27/03



JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER